

SPEECH

OF

MR. E. STANLY, OF NORTH CAROLINA,

1871 ON 1872

THE GALPHIN CLAIM.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, JULY 6, 1850.

[SECOND EDITION.]

The report of the Select Committee, made on the letter of the Secretary of War, concerning the payment of the Galphin claim, being under consideration—

Mr. STANLY said: I regret very much, Mr. Speaker, that the House refused to lay on the table the report of the Galphin claim. I voted in a small minority to dispose of this matter by laying it on the table, and I did so with the view of enabling the House to proceed with the public business.

The appropriation bills, which are indispensable for the support of the Government, are not yet acted on. California is still cruelly kept out of the Union. Thousands of laboring men in our country are begging us to protect them from the effects of the British tariff of 1846—a tariff which we are informed gives great satisfaction to England. Hundreds of honest claimants are supplicating us to act upon bills reported for their relief. All these matters are demanding our attention, while we are wasting our time in ridiculous efforts to make, or to prevent making, party capital out of the Galphin report. Let the Government stand still—let California wait—let the British lion complacently smile at the folly of the Americans, who, boasting of their freedom, are making themselves as dependent on England as if we were still her colonies—let honest creditors suffer—the Galphin claim alone demands all our patriotic consideration. If gentlemen on the other side of this Hall, who have elected their Speaker and their Clerk, and have control here, will insist in thus spending time, it is becoming and proper that we look into other matters of improper conduct among their friends.

But, first, a few words on the Galphin claim. I regret, as every gentleman in the country must, that the Secretary of War continued to act as agent of this claim while he held his place in the Cabinet. It is a matter of taste and of delicacy, about which we may differ, as it seems we do differ. But I think there is an opinion nearly unanimous that it was not becoming in Mr. Crawford to act as an agent of this claim while he was in the Cabinet. As a member of a party, his conduct was inconsiderate, if not unkind, towards the other members of the Cabinet. But no honorable man has imputed anything dishonorable to Mr. Crawford. His conduct has been unfortunate and unwise, but his integrity stands fair and unimpeached.

The Whig party are no more to blame for this act of his than the Democratic party is for Mr. Van Buren's bad conduct, or for the indelicacy or impropriety which marked the conduct of General Cass, in obtaining *sixty-eight thousand dollars* for extra allowances, which Congress never authorized to be paid; nor for his forming a company, while in the Cabinet, to speculate in public lands. Neither the conduct of Mr. Crawford nor of General Cass has been criminal. Both, in my judgment, have been unjustifiable. As Secretary of War, General Cass could have advantages which citizens of the country could not have. He had opportunities of enabling his company to monopolize the choice tracts of land, to know when they would be in market, and then to raise the price and sell them to settlers who were compelled to purchase. The Whig party have not endorsed, and never will endorse or sanction, Mr. Crawford's conduct. The Democratic party made General Cass their standard-bearer, "unanointed and unannealed," with all these sins on his head. When they shout "Galphin, Galphin," are we not justified in retorting, *sixty-eight thousand dollars extra allowances—speculations in public lands?* I do not intend to assail General Cass personally. I only refer to well known facts. No Whig, who has any self-respect, or any regard for public opinion, will violate all the decencies of life by uttering calumnies in relation to this gentleman. And he who imputes dishonesty to either Mr. Crawford or Mr. Cass, merits and will receive the contempt of all fair minded men. They will both comfort themselves with the reflection—

"'Tis but the fate of place, and the rough brake
That virtue must go through."

It is only to be regretted that they did not further reflect, that

"Things done well,
And with a care, exempt themselves from fear;
Things done without example, in their issue
Are to be feared."

They are to be blamed for a bad example; they forget that "all things are lawful unto me, but all things are not expedient."

A few words more on the Galphin claim.

The act for the relief of Galphin is in the following words:

"Be it enacted, &c., &c., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and required to examine and adjust the claim of the late George Galphin, under the treaty made by the Governor of Georgia with the Creek and Cherokee Indians, in the year 1773, and to pay the amount which may be found due to Milledge Galphin, executor of the said George Galphin, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

"Approved August 14, 1848."

The wrong in this case, if any wrong has been done, was in passing this act. I do not understand it is denied that George Galphin had a claim. It is admitted that *under the treaty* referred to, the claim of Galphin was acknowledged to be due. Then the act of Congress authorized and *"required"* the Secretary of the Treasury to adjust the claim *"under the treaty made by the Governor of Georgia, with the Creek and Cherokee Indians, in 1773,"* and *"to pay the amount which may be found due."* The Secretaries who paid the principal and interest, (Mr. Walker and Mr. Meredith,) were not to be blamed for obeying an act of Congress. Congress is to blame, not the Secretaries, if blame rests anywhere. And let it not be forgotten, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Polk approved this bill; he seems to have been informed of the merits of the claim. How this is, can be explained, perhaps, by the honorable member from South Carolina, the chairman of the Galphin committee, (Mr. BURT,) when he addresses the House. That gentleman now thinks, *"that the claim of the representatives of George Galphin was not a just demand against the United States."* The gentleman did not think so in August, 1848; for I have before me a letter, published evidently by authority, from a Georgia paper, which, as part of the history of this case, I read to the House.

[Here is the article which Mr. S. had before him:]

From the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle and Sentinel.

THE GALPHIN CLAIM—MR. BURT.

You are requested to publish the following letter. The original has been sent to Washington:

WASHINGTON, 14th August, 1848.

"DEAR SIR: I have the pleasure to say that the bill in which you are interested has just been signed by the Speaker of the House, and will be approved by the President.

"With great respect, your obedient servant,

"Dr. M. GALPHIN."

"ARMISTEAD BURT.

Frail memories require remembrances. They are now supplied, because they are refreshing.

The bill for the relief of Galphin passed on Saturday, the 12th of August. It was approved on the 14th, (Sunday intervened.) Whose "heifer was ploughed" with in the mean time? The "will" of the then President was spoken of as a "fixed fact." His approval was known in advance, or the guessing was so close as to have astonished the artistic skill of the East.

As "a dolphin of the woods and a wild boar of the seas," we subjoin the following resolution:

"That the claim of the representatives of George Galphin was not a just demand against the United States."

Verily, "the pleasure" of '48 acidified in '50. It had a vinegar twang, and fit only for common "pickling."

In good sooth, the "will" of the President was pinched, in 1848, into an "approved" form. In 1850 it has been snubbed or smashed.

Oddsbodkins! Mr. Burt is clever on a congratulation and resolution. Let us be thankful, and watch.

OMEGA.]

Now, sir, it does seem that the gentleman from South Carolina had informed the President, Mr. Polk, of the merits of this bill.

Mr. BURT (Mr. STANLEY yielding the floor for explanation) desired to say a single word, and no more. It was faintly in his remembrance that such a letter as the gentleman from North Carolina had read was hastily written by him, at his desk in this Hall, for the purpose of saving the mail. But he considered it due to the President to say, that he had never had a word with that high functionary on the subject, and that he had no peculiar means of information. What he wrote was a mere expression of opinion.

Mr. STANLEY. But the gentleman had evidently watched the progress of the bill with interest. As Mr. Polk had vetoed the French spoliation bill, he might with as much propriety have vetoed this; for Mr. Polk was Speaker, if I mistake not, in 1836, when the Galphin claim was discussed in Congress. The gentleman from South Carolina evidently thought the claim an honest one then, for he raised no objection, as he might have done. He seems to have been acquainted with the passage of the bill, and informed his friend—the bill *"will be approved by the President;"* for he watched its progress with parental solicitude—watched when the Speaker signed the bill, and informed Dr. M. Galphin that the bill *"will be approved by the President."* The inference is irresistible, that the chairman of the Galphin committee had informed Mr. Polk of the merits of the bill; that Mr. Polk thought the claim was just, and ought to be paid; and that he personally and officially approved the bill.

Then, as far as this is a party matter, Mr. Polk, who approved the bill, Mr. Walker who examined and paid the principal, and the chairman of the Select Committee, who stands high in

the estimation of his party, who is chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs—these three distinguished Democrats, are as thoroughly “Galphanized” as any three Whigs can be, in or out of the Cabinet. Let it be particularly observed, that in his testimony before the committee, Mr. Robert J. Walker said of the Galphin claim, “the facts being of a peculiar character, the claim for interest remains an open question.” And he also said, “that if he entertained serious doubts on a question of law, and demanded the opinion of the Attorney General on that question, he would abide by his opinion.” The attempt is now made to give this matter a party aspect—to blame the Whig party for it. The gentleman from Ohio, on the committee, (Mr. DISNEY,) has exerted his talents to the utmost on the question of interest. The gentleman has signally failed in his effort to justify Mr. Walker for paying the principal, and to blame Mr. Meredith for paying the interest. The gentleman, I take it is no lawyer; if he ever studied law, he did so but a short while, and quit many years since, for he is evidently one of those scholars who “hold the eel of science by the tail.” His speech has shown he was not well informed in legal matters. The law is a jealous mistress, and requires undivided attention; and when a lawyer turns politician, he soon finds his law knowledge leaves him faster than Bob Acre’s courage oozed out at the ends of his fingers. I have no respect for the legal opinions of lawyer politicians. This same gentleman, in a speech made in the early part of this session, declared that tho’ he held the Wilmot proviso unconstitutional, yet he should be glad of an opportunity of sending a bill with that proviso in it to the President. To do a great right, he would be willing to do a little wrong, was the argument used by the gentleman.

Now, sir, I want no better reply to this speech and argument of his on the Galphin business, than the fact, that he thinks he could support the Constitution of the United States by sending an unconstitutional measure to the President! Truly, Mr. Crawford has little reason to be hurt at the opinion this gentleman may entertain of the propriety of his conduct.

But, Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of some of those who have come on the stage within two or three years past to a dark page in the history of the Democratic party in this country. Some of the loudest in their denunciation are evidently uninformed in the history of Democratic “Galphanizing.” I invite the attention of the youthful Democracy to Reports of Committees of 25th Congress, 3d session, 1838-’39, Report No. 313. After the whole country had been astounded by the defalcation of Swartwout, and by the correspondence between Mr. Woodbury and certain receivers of public money, a committee was appointed, who investigated and made the report I have referred to. Let me mention a few cases in this report: Mr. William Linn was a receiver of public money at Galena. On the 23d of June, 1834—mark the dates—Mr. Taney, Secretary of the Treasury, began his complaints, that Mr. Linn did not promptly deposit the money in his hands in bank. The correspondence continued by Mr. Woodbury, as Secretary of the Treasury, in October, 1834, to January 26, 1838, when Mr. Woodbury informed him his resignation was accepted by the President; and Mr. Woodbury regretted “so large a balance stands unadjusted in your hands.” Balance due from Linn, fifty-five thousand nine hundred and sixty-two dollars and six cents, (\$55,962 06.) Is this “Galphanizing,” or not?

Take another case. Rep. No. 313, page 167: W. P. Harris was receiver at Columbus, Mississippi. The correspondence with him commences in January, 1834. In March, 1834, the Secretary makes complaints of Harris’s conduct. In August, 1835, Mr. Woodbury threatens to dismiss him. In the correspondence is a letter from John F. H. Claiborne, dated September 15, 1835, in which he speaks of Harris as “one of the main pillars of the Democratic cause, and one of the earliest and most distinguished friends of the Administration in Mississippi. His family and connexions are extremely influential, and all of them are co-operating with us in the arduous struggle which we are now making.” Mr. Harris is represented as an honorable man, of “diffused and deserved popularity.” This letter was sent by Mr. Harris to the Secretary of the Treasury or the President.

In August, 1836—mark the dates—Mr. Harris writes a letter to the President, tendering his resignation, in which he uses the following language, which I read:

“In conclusion, I will take the liberty of recommending to you, for appointment as my successor, Colonel Gordon D. Boyd, of Attala county. You are, probably, acquainted with his public character, as he has been for several years a prominent member of our State Legislature, and has been throughout *an ardent supporter of your Administration, and an unyielding advocate of the principles of Democracy.*”

He was also recommended as the “warm personal friend” of W. P. Harris.

On page 184 of Rep. 313 is this short statement:

“Balance due from Mr. Harris, one hundred and nine thousand one hundred and seventy-eight dollars and eight cents—(\$109,178 08.)—See statement.

Is this “Galphanizing,” or only supporting the principles of Democracy?

Is this all? Not quite.

In December, 1836, Mr. Woodbury commences his correspondence with “Colonel Gordon D. Boyd,” and continues not quite a year. Remember, *Colonel Boyd* was an “ardent supporter” of the Administration, and “an unyielding advocate of the principles of Democracy,” the chosen successor of GENERAL Harris—his “warm personal friend”—of General Harris, who “enjoyed such a diffused and deserved popularity,” and was one of the “main pillars of the Democratic cause.”

Well, what was the result of Boyd's appointment? In June, 1837, Mr. Garesche, appointed by Mr. Woodbury to examine the affairs of the office in Columbus, reported as follows, and I call the particular attention of the anti-Galphin orators to it. Mr. Garesche says to the Secretary of the Treasury.

"The man seems really penitent, and I am inclined to think, in common with his friends, that he is honest, and has been led away from his duty by the example of his predecessor, and a certain looseness in the code of morality, which here does not move in so limited a circle as it does with us at home." Another receiver would probably follow in the footsteps of the two. You will not, therefore, be surprised if I recommend his being retained, in preference to another appointment; for he has his hands full now, and will not be disposed to speculate any more."—Page 189 of Report 313.

And was Colonel Gordon D. Boyd, the "warm personal friend of General Harris," the "ardent supporter of the Administration," the "unyielding advocate of the principles of Democracy," the "really penitent" Colonel Boyd—was he removed? No, sir; on the 7th of October, 1837, Mr. Woodbury acknowledged the receipt of his resignation!! On page 189, is this short statement:

"G. D. Boyd is indebted fifty thousand nine hundred and thirty-seven dollars and twenty-nine cents, (\$50,937 29,) as per last statement at the Treasury."

Is this "Galphinizing," or only sustaining the principles of Democracy?

Next is the case of Littlebury Hawkins, receiver at Helena; on page 192 of the report is this statement—

"Balance due from Mr. Hawkins, one hundred thousand dollars, (\$100,000,) per last settlement at Treasury."

Mr. A. G. Mitchell, receiver at Cahaba: on page 196 is this remark—

"Mr. Mitchell a late receiver at Cahaba, is indebted fifty-four thousand six hundred and twenty-six dollars and fifty-five cents," (\$54,626 55.)

The next case of Democratic "Galphinizing," is that of Mr. Childress, receiver at Helena, Louisiana; on page 199 of the report it is said:

"Balance due from Paris Childress, twelve thousand four hundred and forty-nine dollars and seventy-six cents," (\$12,449 76.)

The next case is that of Mr. J. Allen, receiver at Tallahassee; on page 218 of the report it is stated that—

"Mr. Allen is indebted to the Government twenty-six thousand six hundred and ninety-one dollars and fifty-seven cents." (\$26,691 57.)

Then there is a correspondence between Mr. Woodbury and Mr. Spencer, receiver at Fort Wayne. I wish to read one or two interesting extracts.

Mr. HARLAN stated, for the information of the gentleman from North Carolina and of the House, that Col. John Spencer was not now, nor at the time to which the gentleman refers, a defaulter to the Government; but, on the contrary, was both then and now a creditor of the Government; and a previous Congress and the executive officers of the Government have so decided.

Mr. STANLY said he was glad to hear that one man had paid what he owed.

Mr. DUNHAM explained, that Colonel Spencer was improperly set down as a defaulter, the Government being in fact in his debt.

Mr. STANLY. Was not judgment obtained against him by the United States?

Mr. DUNHAM. It was improperly obtained, and was afterwards released when the facts were made known.

Mr. STANLY said he should be glad to know how the release was obtained; was it because he was "a pillar of Democracy?" But it was not the amount of the defalcation in this case that I was commenting on. It was to the reason given by Mr. Hendricks, and Mr. Woodbury's answer, to which I ask attention—especially the reasons why Mr. Woodbury ought not to remove him.

After various complaints from Mr. Woodbury, Mr. William Hendricks writes to him in behalf of Mr. Spencer. In that letter Mr. Hendrick says:

"It would, to some extent, produce excitement if he were removed, for he has many warm and influential friends, both at Fort Wayne and in Dearborn county, from which he removed to his present residence. *Better let it be.*"

In answer to this "better let it be," Mr. Woodbury wrote as short a letter to Mr. Hendricks as General Cass did to the Chicago convention. Hear it:

"TREASURY DEPARTMENT, September 7, 1836.

"SIR: Your letter of the 31st ultimo is received, and I am happy to inform you that Mr. Spencer's explanations have been such that he will probably continue in office.

I am, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

"Hon. WILLIAM HENDRICKS.

LEVI WOODBURY, Sec. of Treasury."

The reasons of Mr. Spencer continuing in office will be known, when we hear the following from his letter to Mr. Woodbury, dated October 27, 1836:

"My Democratic friends think that I ought not to leave until after we hold an election for President, on the 7th of November, which I have concluded to wait."

"The Democratic party; the election; the main pillars of the Democratic cause; the unyielding advocates of the principles of Democracy;"—these were the reasons assigned for keeping men in office who had neglected their duties, abused their trusts, and kept the public money for their own purposes.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, in parentheses, what I think of General Cass's letters. That he was more unfortunate in his Nicholson than in his Chicago letter. We never could agree in the South in construing the Nicholson letter. General Cass was as clear and definite in his letter as Launcelot, in the Merchant of Venice, was, when he gave old Gobbo directions for finding the way to the Jew's house:

"Gobbo.—Master young gentleman, I pray you, which is the way to Master Jew's?

"Launcelot.—Turn up on your right hand, at the next turning, but, at the next turning of all, on your left; marry, at the very next turning, turn of no hand, but turn down indirectly to the Jew's house."

'Twas a hard way to hit—as hard as to hit General Cass's meaning.

I will not detain the House further by a reference to other cases mentioned in the same report.

But, sir, it may be said, we heard all this in 1840; the judgment of the country has been passed on these transactions. That excuse will not answer. I have, for some weeks past, been making inquiries relative to the office-holders under Mr. Polk. I suppose that when the office-holders in this city were encouraged to leave their offices and make speeches against General Taylor; when funds were collected out of the clerks by your public officers; when some of them were engaged in writing party essays, that some of the Government money was probably used for the election by the "pillars of the Democratic party." I have judged correctly; and I invite the special attention of all those who have been thundering anathemas against the Galphin claim to hear my facts.

I find that various public officers, such as Indian agents, collectors of customs, contractors, navy agents, marshals, pension agents, &c., holding office under the last Administration, have retained in their hands, or misapplied—to use no harsh words—the public money intrusted to their custody, to an amount of nearly ONE MILLION OF DOLLARS! I have a table before me, and some of the names I will give, many of the names I do not wish to bring to public notice, because all of them have not been mentioned in the newspapers of the day.

[Here Mr. STANLY read the names of Denby, Beard, Collins, and some others referred to in this list:]

Names.	In what capacity.	Amount claimed.	Names.	In what capacity.	Amount claimed.
Nathaniel Denby -	Indian Agent - - -	\$10,191 69	Richard Hewit -	Pension agent - - -	\$5,101 80
	Agent at Marseillies, France - - -	155,508 48		Sub Indian Agent - - -	18,142 28
	Lieutenant U. S. A. - - -	2,923 64		Contractor, &c. - - -	1,321 45
	Collector of Customs, St. Augustine - - -	1,082 41		Navy Agent - - -	5,894 59
E. L. Beard - - -	Contractor, &c. - - -	50,563 25	G. H. Kennerly -	Contractor, &c. - - -	345 62
Patrick Collins - - -	Surveyor & Inspector, Cincinnati - - -	181,390 40		Assist. Quartermaster -	26,397 26
	Receiver Public Money -	4 344 54		Contractor, &c. - - -	8,122 00
W. B. Scott - - -	Navy Agent - - -	17,897 37		Purser U. S. Navy - - -	8,678 16
	Indian Agent - - -	4,548 84	P. M. Wetmore	Navy Agent - - -	5,767 82
	Indian Agent for the Sac and Fox tribes - - -	73,831 09		Navy Agent - - -	*181,580 79
	Navy Agent - - -	5,551 03		Navy Agent - - -	8,816 93
	Sub-Indian Agent - - -	8,576 57		Navy and Navy Pension Agent - - -	8,157 37
	Purser U. S. Navy - - -	2,326 31		Purser U. S. Navy - - -	13,489 78
	Late Marshal - - -	1,318 05		Navy Pension Agent - -	1,119 50
	Navy Agent - - -	4,011 41		Navy Agent - - -	1,341 31
				Agent for paying Pensioners - - -	6,862 22
					\$826,204 16

* Mr. Wetmore, Navy Agent, has paid since he was sued, \$92,000.

Yes, sir, nearly one million of dollars is the amount of defalcation specified in this list.

Patrick Collins, of Cincinnati, "Galphinizes" \$181,390 40 in the district represented by the gentleman, (Mr. DISNEY,) whose lucid arguments on interest will confound the Supreme Court. He only gave a bond for ten thousand dollars, but as he was "a pillar of Democracy," the gentleman is mute as to this defalcation. Why has his denunciation been suppressed? The truth is, that modern Democracy seems to think that its "pillars" have a right to take out of the public crib what they please.

Mr. DISNEY rose to explain in reference to the case of Collins. The defalcation alleged against Collins was on account of fees and uncollected bonds, which were all explained, and were handed over by Collins to his successor, by whom they are still held.

Mr. STANLY. In other words, Mr. Collins set up an offset; and does not every defaulter, with more or less success, do the same? There is another statement of this case, however, which

does not exactly tally with that of the gentleman from Ohio. They all, when they have misapplied the public money, make out new accounts. But why has not the gentleman from Ohio called down indignation on Collins? Why has he not investigated this case?

Mr. DISNEY was understood to say he had been endeavoring to have the Collins account settled.

Mr. STANLY congratulated the gentleman on his labor of love; from his argument in the Galphin case, he was no doubt an admirable defender—a friend of Collins. William B. Scott, navy agent, in this city, one of the most active officeholders in collecting money out of public officers here in 1848—he only owes the moderate sum of \$17,897 37. How much of this money was spent against the election of General Taylor, no Whig can tell.

Now, sir, this information I get from reliable sources. And this is not all. If gentlemen will call for information, I will show other defalcations. What will the Democracy of the country say to all this? Will they not say that those who are crying out “Galphin! Galphin!” are straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel?

One other item of Galphinizing in this city I must mention. The editor of the *Union* newspaper in this city has been among the foremost in denouncing the Cabinet as the “Galphin Cabinet,” and abusing the Whigs as the “Galphin party.” Let us examine his conduct a moment. I hold in my hand Senate report No. 149, made by Mr. Borland on the 8th June, 1850; from which it appears that the Senate, at the last session, ordered to be printed ten thousand copies of the opinions of the Supreme Court, in the cases of *Smith vs. Turner*, and *Norris vs. the City of Boston*, making a pamphlet of one hundred and eighty pages. Mr. Borland is a Democrat, a Senator from Arkansas, and a gentleman of character and intelligence.

It seems that Mr. Belt, who is “printer to the Senate,” has received more than twelve thousand dollars for printing this pamphlet. According to his construction of the contract, he charged the moderate sum of thirty-seven thousand two hundred dollars for the ten thousand copies? Mr. Borland makes various estimates of the cost of this printing. If charged fairly, he says, under Tiffin & Streeper’s contract, thirtieth Congress, the total for this printing would amount to only five hundred and twenty-two dollars and fifty cents, (522 50!) Hear Mr. Borland:

“The committee do not suppose that it could be deemed reasonable to exact a higher rate of compensation than the rates established by the joint resolution of 1819; for the printers are willing now, and have ever proposed, to relinquish their present contracts, and undertake to execute all the public printing at rates less than those of 1819, reduced to the extent of twenty per cent.”

Now hear the following, ye thunderers of “Galphin”—pay especial attention to this:

“Yet the committee have ascertained by calculation, that this document, at the *full* rates of 1819, would not amount to more than two thousand eight hundred and sixty-four dollars and fifty cents, (2,864 50!)”

Yet, sir, twelve thousand five hundred dollars were paid for this pamphlet. Mr. Ritchie, I am informed, was the surety of Mr. Belt for the performance of his contract; he was the arbitrator, who settled the price for Belt, and, as I learn from a member of this House, Mr. Ritchie is also the assignee of Belt, and holds the contract for his own advantage! Now, sir, is this Galphinizing, or what is it called? Mr. Ritchie, too, is treating the Government, as some of the early settlers of our country were said to have treated the Indians. They claimed the right to take land from the Indians, for they argued—1. The earth is the Lord’s, and the fullness thereof; 2. The Lord hath given the earth to his saints; and, 3. We are the saints.

The Democrats have had the spoils so long, they claim the right to have them, and think Whigs ought not even to pay debts, although Congress directs it. Why cannot Mr. Ritchie pour out some of his denunciation against Denby!

Mr. HAYMOND. He is one of the “élite” of the Richmond Democracy.

Mr. STANLY. Yes, sir, as my friend from Virginia says, because he is one of the “élite”—one of the aristocratic Democracy of Virginia. Besides the large sums unjustly withheld by these public officers—by the Denbys, the Wetmores, and the Patrick Collinses, of the last Administration, there are others still.

I hold in my hand a list—“Balances due from collectors and surveyors of customs, who were appointed between the 4th of March, 1845, and 4th of March, 1849, and *are now out of office*,” and that balance is one hundred and thirty-nine thousand three hundred and seventy-eight dollars and sixteen cents, (\$139,378 16.) And these, sir, are some of those poor calumniated victims on proscription, removed from office by General Taylor!

And still more: Here is a list of “balances due by receivers of public moneys from sales of lands, who were appointed during the four years ending the 4th of March, 1849, and were out of office on the 1st July, 1850.” This balance is twenty-five thousand four hundred and forty-two dollars sixty-one cents, (\$25,442 61.) How cruel that such men should be removed from office!

There are some instances of abuse, to which I wish now to refer. The last Administration had its favorites, besides the defaulters, and they were well taken care of. Take the case of Mr. A. J. Donelson. In 1846, in April, he was Minister to Berlin. He had an outfit of \$9,000 and his salary. In 1848 he was sent by Mr. Polk Minister to Germany, or the German Confederation. For this he received another outfit and salary. He was well paid for travelling a few hundred miles, and had nothing to do when he got there; for the German Confederation

soon ceased to exist. Mr. Donelson was recalled, and the Administration denounced for recalling him. What public service Mr. Donelson ever rendered is yet to be known. Here is a statement of the amounts paid him :

Amount of salaries received by A. J. Donelson, from 10th April, 1846, to 1st November, 1849.

1846, April 10.	Outfit for Berlin.....	\$9,000
1848, September 1st.	To amount of salary as Minister to Berlin, from April 10, 1846, at \$9,000 per annum.....	21,500
1848, September 1st.	Expenditures made as Minister to Frankfort, prior to the separa- tion of the Prussian and German mission.....	2,250
1849, November 1st.	Outfit to Frankfort.....	9,000
1849, November 1st.	Infit from Frankfort.....	2,250
1849, November 1st.	Salary from 1st of September to date.....	10,500
Total.....		\$54,500

And now let us see how well Mr. Attorney General Clifford was taken care of. He was sent to Mexico, to aid in exchanging the ratification of the treaty. For this he received an outfit of \$9,000 and a salary. After his blundering with what he called a protocol, which was no protocol, and by his conduct threatening at one time the most serious dangers to the country, he was returned as Minister to Mexico. And thus the account stands with this "pillar of the Democratic party."

The following are the payments which were made to Mr. Nathan Clifford, late United States Minister to Mexico, viz :

For warrant No. 2,662, dated March 18, 1848, for.....	\$9,000 00
Do 6,192, do November 28, 1848 for.....	6,000 00
Do 6,323, do December 4, 1848, for.....	375 31
Do 7,351, do February 2, 1849, for.....	500 00
Do 7,965, do March 9, 1849, for.....	146 00
Do 609, do September 4, 1849, for.....	373 00
	<hr/>
	\$16,394 31
And for balance due to him on settlement.....	17,854 91

Whole amount received by Mr. Clifford from 18th March, 1848, to 4th Sept., 1849, \$34,249 22

Is this "Galphinizing," or what is it ? And now those who have tolerated all these abuses are denouncing the Whig party as the "Galphin party." Truly, sir, do these noisy declaimers resemble a Democratic overseer I once heard of in the southern country. He had been informed that the squirrels were eating the corn, and he took six good men from their work to kill the squirrels, while he kept a pet bear who was allowed to devour corn entirely uncontrolled. I am not aware what public service Mr. Clifford has done to entitle him to such reward. He is a gentleman of respectable abilities, and has been Attorney General ; but I think the only monument to his memory, as Attorney General, will be, that after a few of his speeches the Supreme Court were compelled to adopt a two hour rule. Now, compare his services with those of Reverdy Johnson. We have seen published the opinion of the Supreme Court, in the case of *Fleming vs. Page*, involving the right to levy duties on goods imported into certain ports in Mexico during the war. This case had been decided in the court below against the United States. By Mr. Johnson's efforts the case was brought to the Supreme Court, and after his masterly argument even the judge, who had been of a different opinion, was convinced, the judgment was reversed, and the United States saved nearly seven millions of dollars by this decision. For his services he received no compensation, and would receive none, though some of his predecessors for services of a like character had been compensated. In the case of the Louisiana land claims, he saved to the Government two millions of dollars.

And now, sir, this is the gentleman of unsullied private character—of spotless integrity—upon whom, as his colleague in the Senate remarked, before he was Attorney General, the mantle of Wirt had fallen—this colleague, too, one of the first men in our country ; this is the distinguished lawyer whose conduct and opinions certain persons are disposed to make themselves ridiculous by censuring.

Mr. Johnson and Mr. Meredith having passed through life with unstained reputations, (of which their country will be proud,) will smile at the impotent malice that attempts to wound them, knowing that all good men will not "mistake the venom of the shaft for the vigor of the bow."

There is no patriotic gentleman of any party whose heart will not cordially approve the sentiment of Cicero, who, in one of his orations, when speaking of the duty of good men to defend the fame of the illustrious dead, said, he thought himself "bound to fight for their fame, glory, and memory, with as much zeal as for the altars and temples of my country ; and if it were necessary to take arms in defence of their praise, I should take them as strenuously as they themselves did for the defence of our common safety." Surely, then, it is right to guard the reputation of eminent public men, though still living.

I regretted very much, Mr. Speaker, to hear the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CARTER) depart from that propriety which ought to mark our language here, and indulge in harsh epithets toward the members of the Cabinet. The gentleman, I am satisfied, spoke under excitement; and in his calm moments will regret the violence of his language, because it was unbecoming in him, and unjust toward those whom he denounced. But, when I saw smiles of approbation in the countenances of a few on the other side, while the gentleman from Ohio was speaking, I was forcibly reminded of a scene drawn by Catlin, during his travels among the Indian tribes. It was, I think, among the Sioux Indians a custom, when they were preparing for war, to kill a dog, place his liver on a stake four or five feet high, and the barbarous and beastly warriors then formed a ring, and while they danced around, each man would bite a piece from the liver. I thought those who enjoyed so violent a speech were men of taste congenial to that of those uncivilized barbarians.

Mr. Speaker, I will conclude. I repeat, I do not justify the conduct of the Secretary of War in acting as a claim-agent while he was a member of the Cabinet. It was in bad taste, to say the least. It is a bad example; and, apart from other considerations, a sense of public duty forbids me to approve his conduct. If this act is justified, auditors, comptrollers, and other officers, will act as claim-agents, and the most enormous abuses be practised; and in saying this, I feel, as I think Mr. Crawford felt, when he was anxious that Mr. Walker should act in this claim before Mr. C. came into the Cabinet.

I desire the truth should be known by the country, that it may see there are as many Democrats as Whigs responsible for the payment of the Galphin claim; that some of those now trying to use the payment of this claim for party purposes have justified enormous abuses on the part of the pillars of the Democratic party; that some of them have been guilty of taking public money for unjust claims. When the truth can be known, the small orators of party may cry "Galphin!" until "Galphin!" the hills, "Galphin!" the woods, "Galphin!" the rocks, resound. They may buy starlings, and teach them to cry Galphin, nothing but Galphin! It will be a lesson the birds will soon learn, for the starling orators have learnt it in a few weeks. But when the honest people of this country know the whole truth, when they see that the Democratic "pillars" have plundered the Treasury, and passed along unrebuked by their party friends; when they hear the facts I have mentioned just now, they will tell each noisy drummer of party, "thou hypocrite, first cast out the beam out of thine own eye, and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye."

NOTE.—Another instance of Democratic "Galphinizing," deserves the consideration of the "Pillars of Democracy."

It appears from the report of Committees, 2d session, 27th Congress, No. 454, vol. 2: case of Captain Buckner for removing Chickasaw Indians. Report made by Mr. Stuart, of Illinois, March 17, 1842.

In this case Col. R. M. Johnson acted as agent or attorney for Buckner, while Johnson was Vice President. He was the only man who prosecuted the claim before the Department. Before the claim was allowed Johnson asked Buckner to purchase for him a farm in Arkansas, and some negroes, provided he got the money, which Buckner declined; but while riding to the Department, on the day the requisition was obtained, he agreed to lend Johnson eighteen thousand dollars, (\$18,000.) He got a requisition that day for \$37,749, and Johnson, the Democratic Vice President, received the \$18,000.

Johnson gave his notes to Buckner, *without interest*, but they were afterwards delivered up, and Buckner received in payment of them, the undivided half of four hundred acres of land in Kentucky, known as the "White Sulphur Springs," with the improvements. Buckner says that at the time, he took a *bond for a deed*, for this land, and delivered up the notes. It was worth, including improvements, about fifty dollars an acre. This would make his whole security only ten thousand dollars, (\$10,000,) so that, at that estimate, Johnson received \$8,000 more than he paid back, for his services, rendered while he was Vice President.

In this case the committee conclude their report as follows:

"From a thorough investigation of this case, the committee are constrained to say there was no evidence to justify the accounting officers of the Treasury in allowing this large sum of money. The testimony of Captain Buckner states that he was *introduced* by Col. R. M. Johnson, who attended with him *almost daily*, until the requisition was obtained. There is some reason to believe that these *daily visits* of a popular Vice President had a more persuasive influence with the accounting officers in passing this claim, than the strength of the testimony by which it was sustained.

"The whole amount thus paid to Captain Buckner was \$146,293 50; of this amount, the sum of \$37,749 was, beyond doubt, improperly paid. If the committee have been correct in the view they have taken of this case, the Chickasaw fund has sustained a loss of \$122,243 50, attributable to the want of prudent economy and faithfulness on the part of those connected with its disbursement, and the accounting officers."